

REMARKS

I. Summary Of Office Action

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Young U.S. Patent No. 4,706,121 (hereinafter "Young 4,706,121") in view of Young et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,532,754 (hereinafter "Young '754") and Yuen et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,307,173 (hereinafter "Yuen").

II. Applicants' Reply

Each of claims 1-14 were rejected under § 103(a) using Young '754 as a prior art reference. Applicants respectfully submit that Young '754 does not qualify as prior art under any of 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-14 is improper and should be withdrawn.

The current application is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/898,298, filed July 2, 2001, which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 08/955,430, filed October 21, 1997, which is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 08/400,166, filed March 7, 1995, which a division of U.S. Patent Application No. 08/079,502, filed June 16, 1993, which is a continuation-in-part of Young et al. U.S. Patent Application No. 08/033,773, filed March 19, 2003, now U.S. Patent No. 5,353,121 (hereinafter "Young 5,353,121").

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-14 are fully supported by Young 5,353,121. See, for example, col. 4, ll. 9-61, col. 20, l. 31 through col. 23, l. 33, and FIGS. 23-24 of Young 5,353,121. Therefore, the current application is entitled to at least the filing date of Young 5,353,121, which is in the priority chain of the current application, as shown above. Young 5,353,121 was filed on March 19, 1993, which is significantly earlier than the July 2, 1996 publication date of

Young '754. Therefore, Young '754 does not qualify as prior art under § 102(a) or § 102(b).

Moreover, the application on which Young '754 issued is a continuation of Young 5,353,121, from which the current application also claims priority, as shown above. Because the current application and Young '754 properly claim the benefit from the same patent, the current application is entitled to the same effective filing date as Young '754. Therefore, the patent granted on Young '754 does not have an earlier effective filing date than the date of invention of the claimed subject matter. For at least this reason, applicants respectfully submit that Young '754 does not qualify as prior art under § 102(e).

Thus, Young '754 does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a), 102(b), or 102(e). None of the other sections of 35 U.S.C. § 102 are applicable in the instant case. Therefore, Young '754 does not qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102. For at least this reason, Young '754 cannot be used in a § 103(a) rejection of applicants' claims 1-14. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-14 be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration in light of the foregoing remarks and a favorable action are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
/Maxine Lee/

Maxine Lee
Reg. No. 61,495
Agent for Applicants
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 75563